

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3 AEVOE CORP., a California corporation, )

4 )  
5 Plaintiff, )

6 vs. )

Case No.: 2:12-cv-00053-GMN-NJK

**ORDER**

7 AE TECH CO., LTD., a Taiwan corporation; )

8 S&F CORPORATION *dba* SF PLANET )

9 CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation, )

10 and GREATSHIELD INC., a Minnesota )

11 corporation, )

12 Defendants. )

13 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States  
14 Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, (ECF No. 650), which recommends that default judgment be  
15 entered against Defendant AE Tech Co., Ltd. (“AE Tech”) and that AE Tech’s counterclaims  
16 be dismissed with prejudice.

17 A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a  
18 United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1–4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B);  
19 D. Nev. R. IB 3–2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo  
20 determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject,  
21 or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge.  
22 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3–2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is  
23 not required to conduct “any review at all ... of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”  
24 *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a  
25 district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where  
no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122

1 (9th Cir. 2003).

2 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 650) is  
5 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** to the extent that it is not inconsistent with this Order.

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter default against Defendant AE  
7 Tech.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant AE Tech's counterclaims (ECF No. 231)  
9 be **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff Aevoe Corp.'s Motion for Sanctions (ECF  
11 No. 569) is **DENIED as moot**.

12 **DATED** this 12th day of December, 2014.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



---

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
United States District Judge